1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA 2 CHARLESTON DIVISION 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 4 VS. 5 DYLANN STORM ROOF : 2:15 - CR - 472 6 7 Bar Meeting in the above matter held on Thursday, 8 October 1, 2015, commencing at 10:09 a.m., before the 9 Hon. Richard M. Gergel, in the United States Courthouse, 10 Courtroom VI, 85 Broad St., Charleston, South Carolina, 11 29401. 12 13 APPEARED ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES: 14 JAY N. RICHARDSON, ESQ., 1441 Main St., Columbia, SC. 15 NATHAN WILLIAMS, ESQ., P.O. Box 978, Charleston, SC. 16 17 APPEARED ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENSE: 18 DAVID I. BRUCK, ESQ., Washington & Lee School of Law, Lexington, VA. 19 MICHAEL P. O'CONNELL, ESQ., 109 Wappoo Creek Dr., 20 Charleston, SC. 21 2.2 23 REPORTED BY DEBRA L. POTOCKI, RMR, RDR, CRR Official Court Reporter for the U.S. District Court 24 P.O. Box 835 Charleston, SC 29402 25 843/723-2208

```
THE COURT: Mr. Richardson, call your next case,
 1
 2
     please, sir.
 3
               MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you, Your Honor. United
 4
      States versus Dylann Storm Roof, Criminal No. 2:15-472. We're
 5
      here for the bar meeting, Your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: Very good. Good morning, Mr. Bruck, good
 7
      to have you here before us.
 8
               MR. BRUCK: Morning, Your Honor.
 9
               MR. O'CONNELL: Good morning, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: Good to have all defense counsel here.
10
          I have filings, Dockets No. 60 and 61, waiving appearance
11
12
      at the bar meeting, Mr. Bruck.
1.3
               MR. BRUCK: Yes.
14
               THE COURT: And waiving your right to a speedy trial,
15
      is that correct?
16
               MR. BRUCK: Yes.
17
               THE COURT: We'll address the specific issues in just
18
      a minute about any continuance. But I want to confirm those
19
      are on the record, and that explains the defendant's absence,
20
      correct?
21
               MR. BRUCK: Yes.
22
               THE COURT: Very good. Let me first address some
23
     matters to the Government, and then I'll address to you,
24
     Mr. Bruck.
25
          Mr. Richardson, give me a status report; where are we?
```

1.3

2.2

MR. RICHARDSON: Your Honor, in this -- you know, the current posture is we are continuing to work on the case, the investigation is ongoing to some degree. We've provided extensive discovery to defense counsel July the 31st. We provided more than 15,000 pages of discovery, along with electronic audio/video type evidence. On September the 16th we provided an additional round of discovery, which included more electronic evidence, as well as thousands more pages of documents. That process is ongoing, although --

THE COURT: I was about to say, so we can anticipate there's more to come?

MR. RICHARDSON: As in every case, Your Honor. I can tell you the investigation is ongoing, and by nature, that means there's discovery continuing to be created. I will also say there is some material that has not yet been produced, particularly of the electronic variety, that is just going through that processing. We would anticipate that that is not long off from being produced, but it has not yet been produced. It's being worked on.

THE COURT: What kind of timeline are we talking about?

MR. RICHARDSON: I think with respect to the information that previously existed, again, not talking about information that's --

THE COURT: Can't produce what you don't yet have.

MR. RICHARDSON: I would anticipate that we'd be able to do that in the next month. That's a little hard for me to say, because some of it is a technical challenge, given the volume of data and how we convey that, whether we're going to have hard drives that are large enough to do that, whether we need to make some of those, perhaps less critical pieces of evidence available for viewing. That's a question that we're trying to resolve. We're trying to provide it all, because obviously that would be easier for defense counsel. There may be some instances where that is difficult. But I would anticipate that that would be something we'd be able to do, at least substantially within the next month.

THE COURT: Well, obviously defense counsel have a lot on them, they have a lot of work to do, and the sooner you get them the information, the sooner we'll be ready for trial.

Correct? I mean --

MR. RICHARDSON: That's absolutely right. And I can tell you that the core of the discovery, I mean, we're really now talking about the things that are several steps removed, and in many instances, I would argue are irrelevant. We're going to provide them, don't get me wrong, but the core information that's relevant to the case, has been provided.

There are additional matters. But I do want the Court to be clear that we have provided the core of the case, the vast majority.

1.3

2.2

THE COURT: And you are diligently working towards completing that.

MR. RICHARDSON: Absolutely. We have a team of people that are working on completing that. We've done, I think, the vast majority of that. As in every case, there are clean-up matters and then the technical issues with some of the electronic information. But I would anticipate that that's going to be, you know, wrapped up relatively soon. And then, you know, we'll obviously have a role in discovery that continues on.

THE COURT: Well, the Government's given notice of the potential for this being a capital case, but has not yet made a decision. I know there's a process within the Department of Justice on that. Where are we on that?

MR. RICHARDSON: Your Honor, with respect to the notice, I don't think the Government's provided any notice particularly, but the grand jury returned an indictment --

THE COURT: That's what I mean, the grand jury indictment.

MR. RICHARDSON: That process is ongoing. Without going into the details of that deliberative process, what I can tell you is we are working diligently on that. It is a process that does take some time, it's a thoughtful process that requires input from an array of sources, as well as consideration by a number of people. And we are diligently

pursuing that as well. I don't have an estimate for Your

Honor as to when that would be completed, or when that process

would be at a point where I could tell the Court when it is

completed. As the Court is aware, that decision is ultimately

made by the Attorney General, and her schedule and timing and

information she wants, obviously, will dictate that at the end

of the day.

THE COURT: There are a lot of reasons, obviously, we want it done as quickly as can reasonably be accomplished.

I'm in the midst of preparing to approve a tentative budget for this matter. And to the extent it's not a capital case, that's a highly relevant matter, and it is not inexpensive.

And I never like wasted effort. And to the extent -- This is one of those things where time matters. And Mr. Bruck and Mr. O'Connell, they're very experienced at this, and they're going forward with the reasonable assumption this is a capital case.

Mr. Bruck, you've got do that, right? You don't have a choice.

MR. BRUCK: Until we hear otherwise.

THE COURT: Until you hear otherwise, you don't have a choice, y'all just got to do what you got to do. And that's my concern, is it's y'all's decision to make, but the longer it lingers, you know, it leaves a lot in doubt in this case. So if you would just communicate to those up the line who will make it, and I understand, Mr. Richardson, you're not the one

1.3

to make it and you don't set the schedule for the Attorney

General. But if you would communicate the Court's urging that

the process proceed as -- you know, I want it to be

deliberative and all that, I'm not trying to rush a decision,

but I want it to be done as soon as can reasonably be

accomplished. I want it to be a priority in the Department,

because there are a lot of wheels that move based upon that

decision.

MR. RICHARDSON: I will certainly convey that, Your Honor. I can tell Your Honor, in my dealings with the Department of Justice on this, all the way to the highest level, that this is an absolute priority for the Department, and it is something that is not sitting on the back burner by any stretch of the imagination.

THE COURT: We just had a case I'm getting ready to try this next trial term, which was a potential capital case, and we had to go through the process, and ultimately a decision was made not to make it a capital case. And it did affect, you know, my defense counsel's efforts and strategies. It was a difficult case no matter what, and we're proceeding with it, but it took awhile. I mean, I'm aware in a case that perhaps wasn't as high a profile as this one, that the Department takes its responsibilities very seriously, as it should.

So just encourage them to move it along. And I understand

that a lot of, you know, that the Court -- if you'll just indicate the Court is concerned about this.

1.3

MR. RICHARDSON: I will absolutely do that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any matter you think you need to bring to my attention now, that you would like me -- you think I might need to address?

MR. RICHARDSON: Your Honor, the only issue the Government has for today is the context of the continuance of the case and the need, as the Court is well aware, to create a fulsome record under 3161(h)(7), of the reasons why the ends of justice justify a continuance in this case.

We do want to address that, just to make sure that that record is clear. But beyond that, that's the only issue that the Government has.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Richardson, because you're in Columbia, you don't get the daily -- you know, every two-month roster meeting with me, and I wear everybody out by making full findings under the Speedy Trial Act, to the extent that my court reporters sometimes roll their eyes as I begin explaining on each one which parts of the Speedy Trial Act basis of my decision. So don't worry about that, we will do that. And if there's more needs to be done, I'm sure you'll raise it with me.

Anything further?

MR. RICHARDSON: Nothing, Your Honor.

1.3

2.2

THE COURT: Mr. Bruck? Obviously one purpose here is issue of the Speedy Trial Act, and we'll get to that in a moment. Are there matters that need my attention, or that you would like me to address today, or any matters you think I should know about that you think I perhaps do not know?

MR. BRUCK: No matters that require the Court's help or action for today. I wanted to only add one comment to Mr. Richardson's description of the discovery process. The Government does appear to us to have been proceeding as expeditiously as possible. There's been an enormous amount of discovery in this case.

I would like to make it clear on that, although the initial discovery disclosures on July 31st were very very voluminous, the real bulk, the substantive discovery, FBI 302s, the things that we really needed in the case, were all contained in the second disclosure on September 16, which is to say we've only had two weeks with the real bulk of the discovery today.

And that's in no sense a criticism of the Government. They are furnishing the material to us absolutely as soon as they get it. This case is being handled in Washington, we understand that. I just say that to make clear to the Court that the real discovery was not two months ago.

THE COURT: Right. And no matter where this case

goes, what you're now getting, you have to -- you and Mr. O'Connell have to get into, you have to dig into, you have to respond to it, et cetera, right? No matter where this case goes.

MR. BRUCK: Exactly.

2.2

THE COURT: Okay. Talk to me about -- obviously your client has a right to have this case called for trial. I take it you don't wish me to do that.

MR. BRUCK: No. We understand and the client accepts that it's going to take us enough time to get our arms around the case and understand specific details of the allegations and evidence in the case. This is not a case that could possibly be tried within the Speedy Trial Act limits, in our view.

THE COURT: I rarely will find one, Mr. Bruck. I had a surprising development in one case where the lawyer stood up and announced he was ready for trial, and I said, you're on for next week. And I saw his associate sitting next to him pulling on his jacket; and sure enough, within a day I had a call for a continuance. So I wasn't expecting that.

I don't want to drag you over here needlessly for -- I have a roster meeting call every two months. And to the extent that it merely involves what I think is going to take some time, I don't want to waste effort. So tell me what type of continuance the defense would like, and tell me the basis

of why you would need that continuance.

1.3

MR. BRUCK: Well, Mr. Richardson and I discussed this earlier, and we would be satisfied at this point simply to carry the case over for the next term, and address where we are then. We may know --

THE COURT: That's every two months. And I don't have any problem doing that, and I -- you know, what -- and I don't mind doing just periodically doing these same kind of hearings.

Let me just say, I think both of you know this, that we don't need — to the extent something arises that needs to be addressed, we do not need to wait for the next roster meeting to address it. If you'll let me know about that, I'm pretty prompt on responding to things. But if it's helpful to have this sort of set up every two months, I'm game, I mean, I'm fine with that.

MR. BRUCK: I don't know we need to commit to every two months. I think our sense is that in two months we will have a better sense of the timing of this case going forward. So if we were to hold the case open this one time, two months from now we might be able to make a more informed assessment.

THE COURT: So we're talking it's now October 1st, early December.

MR. BRUCK: Early December, correct.

THE COURT: Mr. Richardson, does that make sense to

you?

2.2

MR. RICHARDSON: It does, Your Honor. Mr. Bruck is exactly right. I think one term, whether -- I'm not sure, maybe your terms are -- I can't remember exactly your --

THE COURT: Every two months. I have a rolling trial term, I never quit.

MR. RICHARDSON: No, I totally understand that, but I didn't know whether your next term was a November-December term or an October-November term.

THE COURT: Next one is a November-December term, but we have it in early December for January.

MR. RICHARDSON: I think that would be an appropriate time to have that. I do think Mr. Bruck is correct in the context I would not anticipate long term that we would need to do that every two months. But I'm hopeful that there's some benefit to having at least this next one and maybe there's one more after that, where we have a little bit of time, we're able to update the Court on any timing questions that you might have, and address any small issues that come up.

THE COURT: I have, on some of my complex cases, we have set up regular status conferences in civil cases, not criminal. Criminal kind of take care of themselves with the roster meetings. And in some times we've, you know, not had them, and then other times we've done it earlier, because issues have arisen. So even if we end up continuing beyond a

1.3

2.2

certain term, we may want to set up periodic times in front of the Court, which we can cancel if there are not issues.

I just think that what I don't want to have here is have issues which are slowing one of the parties down, not resolved, and that kind of creates a logjam in the case. I don't want to be part of the problem, I want to be part of the solution of getting these things ready.

So I am not -- I am, as they say, you have to trust anybody from government who says this, I'm just a phone call away, I'm here to help you, but I am. I'm here to help y'all resolve things you can't resolve among yourselves. Obviously this is very experienced counsel on both sides, y'all have been around the track a few times, so a lot of this stuff y'all will just work out among yourselves. But if you can't work it out, I am available on fairly short notice. Okay?

So, Mr. Bruck, you are asking for a continuance for the next term, which is a January 2016 term, is that correct?

MR. BRUCK: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I take it that as a result of having just received this case, that one of the factors that you would like me to consider is to provide you adequate time to prepare for trial, is that correct?

MR. BRUCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And you would also -- you've also identified this because of the volume of discovery, that this

is -- and other issues in the case, that it is a complex 1 2 matter, is that right? 3 MR. BRUCK: Absolutely, yes, sir. 4 THE COURT: Are there any other factors you would 5 like me to consider in terms of addressing the Speedy Trial 6 Act matter? 7 MR. BRUCK: I think that those two cover it. 8 Excuse me. 9 THE COURT: Got your real lawyer there, Mr. Bruck. 10 (Brief interruption in proceedings.) MR. BRUCK: I think under the statute, Mr. O'Connell 11 12 points out, there is also a concurrent state prosecution. 1.3 What effect that has is debatable. 14 THE COURT: We're going to talk about that in just a 15 minute, by the way. 16 First of all, Mr. Richardson, any other matters you would 17 like the Court to address, other factors that might support 18 the defendant's request for a continuance? 19 MR. RICHARDSON: No, Your Honor, I think you've 20 The one thing I feel like I at least should covered it. 21 mention, the Court may want to consider in weighing that, is 2.2 the Crime Victim Rights Act. The victims have a right to not 23 have proceedings with unreasonable delay. Certainly we don't 24 think that applies here, but I at least note that for the

Court, so the Court is aware, in weighing that, that that is

25

2.2

something the Court may consider as part of that, in weighing that determination.

THE COURT: Are you aware of any victims who would oppose a continuance to January?

MR. RICHARDSON: None, Your Honor. I mention that more for the record than anything else.

THE COURT: Well, I obviously do -- I would obviously consider that. It is a factor, particularly after awhile,

I've had victims in cases come and attend the roster meeting,

and the lawyers don't seem to appreciate it, but I think it's

just fine for them to come, myself.

MR. RICHARDSON: I will tell the Court, we've encouraged them to be here today. One representative of one of the victims is here with us today, and so they have been notified, we've encouraged them and continued to encourage them to show up to any and all hearings.

THE COURT: Well, they have a right to have their voices heard in this. And the Court will certainly provide that. So I wish you would continue to give them that notice at each of these meetings. And to the extent that even if you think a continuance is proper, but there's some disagreement, I'm glad to hear from the family or representatives of the family about that. I mean, you'll let them know that.

MR. RICHARDSON: We will do so, and I can assure the Court that were we aware of any such thing, we would convey

that to the Court on their behalf.

2.2

THE COURT: I do find on the matters that have been presented to me and the record presented to me, that the ends of justice are served by a continuance, and outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. And specifically, the recent production of the voluminous discovery, some of the most material discovery, the complexity of the case and the need of defense counsel to be adequately prepared, all support the finding of the Court. And the Court thus grants the defendant's motion for a continuance into the January 2016 term.

Now, let's talk about what's going on with the State, because obviously this is not a common feature of having parallel proceedings. And as they will say, I know when I read in the newspapers that there is a schedule of a July 2016 State trial? Anybody know anything about that?

MR. RICHARDSON: There is a scheduled July 2016 trial date.

THE COURT: You know as much as I do. You probably know more than I do.

MR. RICHARDSON: Your Honor, I think the information, I think your information is good on that score. I think that's about all the information.

We have been working closely with the Solicitor's office on a variety of different levels, and have continued to do so.

But I don't think that I have any update on that beyond -- I 1 2 think there is a July 2016 trial schedule. 3 THE COURT: And is there any discussion going on 4 about sort of who goes first? 5 MR. RICHARDSON: I would say there's some discussion, 6 yes, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: And I take it from that response, there's no resolution of that discussion. 8 9 MR. RICHARDSON: I don't have any updates, Your 10 Honor. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Bruck, do you have any 12 thoughts or anything to contribute to this? 1.3 MR. BRUCK: Well, I would point out that the State, 14 as the Court is aware, has announced its intention to seek the 15 death penalty. For that reason, I think any initial -- that 16 always extends the life of the case a lot. 17 The July trial setting, I think, is the initial one, and 18 we all know that those --19 THE COURT: In your experience, do those things get 20 changed? 21 MR. BRUCK: In my experience, those things get 2.2 changed. 23 THE COURT: You're not in this case. 24 MR. BRUCK: I'm not speaking from inside knowledge, 25 I'm just saying what we all know.

On the federal side, the only reason this case is complex, and the only reason we are moving for a continuance, is the possibility of the death penalty. But for that, it would not be complex, and the case would be over almost immediately, for reasons which we announced at the --

THE COURT: I spoke to my magistrate about that.

MR. BRUCK: Yes. So there are unknowns on both sides, I guess, is what I'm saying.

THE COURT: Welcome to life, right?

MR. BRUCK: Amen.

1.3

2.2

THE COURT: Okay. Folks, I do think that I'm going to be asking at every meeting we have, issues, if there's a desire for continuance, why we need that, and about this parallel proceeding. Again, I just don't like to waste effort, okay? And I'm going to — this comes as a surprise to no one. That to the extent there is — the Government seeks death, I'm going to provide every resource reasonably necessary to provide an adequate defense. You know, reaching out of state to bring Mr. Bruck here, who I've known for 30 years, I have immense respect for him and Mr. O'Connell. I have also great respect for Mr. Richardson. We're going to make sure the defendant has his rights protected. And it's an expensive enterprise to do it. And to the extent we're not on that track, we need to know it sooner, not later, right? I mean, that's just what we need to know.

And to the extent there is a resolution that one of the 1 2 state or federal agencies is going to go first, I'd like to 3 know that soon. Okay? That's a relevant feature in this. 4 And so, Mr. Richardson, you all come armed at each 5 meeting, if you've had discussions either or both of those, 6 that you're going to share those with the Court in a way that 7 you're able to do that. 8 MR. RICHARDSON: I'll certainly do so, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Mr. Bruck, anything that needs my 10 attention? 11 MR. BRUCK: No, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Very good. Okay. Well, I've got a 13 feeling we'll see each other again soon. 14 So with that, the hearing is adjourned. Thank you very 15 much. 16 17 (Court adjourned at 10:28 a.m.) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION I, Debra L. Potocki, RMR, RDR, CRR, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the stenographically recorded above proceedings. S/Debra L. Potocki Debra L. Potocki, RMR, RDR, CRR